

Proposed general solution for initial value problem
for vacuum GR in Chang–Soo/CDJ variables in
anisotropic minisuperspace: preview into inflation

Eyo Eyo Ita III

January 26, 2009

Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics
Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road
Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom
eei20@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

In this paper we illustrate the dynamics of the Chang–Soo/CDJ variables in the description of vacuum GR in anisotropic minisuperspace, uncovering a new class of general solutions in both the degenerate and the nondegenerate sectors. One result of these new variables is the existence of an unbridgable gap between these sectors. The gravitational dynamics self-consistently hold down to arbitrarily small times, implying a semiclassical-quantum correspondence as well as an elimination of the big bang singularity in the nondegenerate sector. We also present an algorithm for constructing general solutions for the spacetimes labelling a general quantum state in these variables.

1 Introduction

Based upon singularity theorems by Hawking and Penrose [1], the classical equations of general relativity coupled to matter under reasonable conditions should ultimately lead to singularities in the structure of spacetime. It is generally accepted that the singularities of general relativity result when the classical theory is extended beyond its domain of applicability. One example of singularities appears in cosmology. The Friedman–Robertson–Walker metric for an isotropic universe is given by

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t) \left[\frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

where $a = a(t)$ is the scale factor governing the rate of expansion of the universe, and $k = -1, 0$ and 1 correspond respectively to a hyperbolic, flat or elliptic topology for the universe. The Einstein's equations for (1) are given by [2]

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{a} + \left[-\frac{\Lambda}{3} + \frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho + 3p) \right] a &= 0; \\ \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 &= \frac{\Lambda}{3} + \frac{8\pi G\rho}{3} - \frac{k}{a^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where ρ and p are respectively the density of matter and pressure in the universe, respectively. Big bang singularities might arise in the FRW model corresponding to solutions of the form of the form $a(t) \sim t^n$, in quantities which scale inversely with a , such as the initial density of the universe, which would classically be infinite at $t = 0$.

It is a hope that the singularities of GR can be resolved by a quantum treatment, which has led to various investigations for example in Loop Quantum Cosmology. The ‘bounce’ has been claimed to avoid the big bang singularity, which persists even in a quantum treatment of (2) in metric variables (See [3] and references therein). One way to avoid the singularity from the FRW equations is to include a cosmological constant Λ , leading to exponential expansion of the universe. While this resolves the singularity at $t = 0$, it does not eliminate the remaining possibilities on first principles.

We will provide further support in the present paper for the notion that it is possible to avoid the big bang singularity, and singularities in general in the Einstein's equations by analyzing the classical description of GR in a new set of variables called the Chang–Soo/CDJ variables.¹

¹See [5] for the formalism and Hilbert space structure of these variables in anisotropic minisuperspace.

A question arises, if the initial conditions governing the universe are truly quantum in nature, as to why a classical treatment might suffice to explain them. The only consistent answer to such a question would come into play if there was a semiclassical quantum correspondence (SQC) implied by the theory. We will proceed in the present paper under the assumption that the equations of motion hold down to arbitrarily small times until the beginning of the universe at $t = 0$, and examine whether or not the big bang singularity can be avoided. Our analysis will shed some insight regarding the initial conditions of the universe.

The Hawking–Penrose singularity theorems rely heavily upon the existence of a spacetime metric. In the modern treatments of general relativity, the metric is stripped of its privileged status, and Yang–Mills type gauge fields play the role of the fundamental variables independently of a background structure, for example as in [4]. In our treatment in [5], the fundamental variables are the CDJ matrix Ψ_{ae} and the Chang–Soo connection X^{ae} with no reference to a metric. By this means, we transfer the question of spacetime singularities from a condition on the metric, into a condition on the new variables and examine the implications.

Cosmic inflation has been provided in [6] as a possible mechanism for the solution to various problems in the cosmological standard model. One of the results of the present paper is to corroborate the notion that inflation and big bang singularity avoidance are intimately intertwined. For the present paper we confine ourselves to anisotropic minisuperspace, which will in turn shed some additional light on the initial conditions of the universe and on the dynamics of the Chang–Soo variables, prior to presenting the full theory.

The layout of the paper is as follows. In section 1 we recall the main results of [5] to set the stage for the Hilbert space of quantum states corresponding to the classical dynamics that we describe. Sections 3 and 4 cover the general solution for nondegenerate vacuum GR in Chang–Soo/CDJ variables in anisotropic minisuperspace. This class of solutions is described by the Hilbert space and includes inflationary solutions. Section 4 culminates with a demonstration of singularity avoidance as a consequence of the new variables. In sections 5, 6 we provide a wide class of solutions within the degenerate sector, and in section 7 we cover the general case of the degenerate sector with an algorithm for construction of the general solution predicted by these variables. All conventions and notations in this paper are as given in [5], of which section 2.1 provides a good summary of the constraints and various useful identities in the Chang–Soo variables which we make use of in this paper.

2 Recapitulation of the Chang–Soo Hilbert space

A main result of [5] was the establishment of a Hilbert space of states corresponding to our description of GR in the Chang–Soo/CDJ variables in anisotropic minisuperspace. A general state satisfying the constraints of general relativity in these variables is given by

$$\psi_\lambda[X] = e^{-\frac{\nu}{2}\lambda^*\cdot\lambda} e^{(\hbar G)^{-1}\lambda\cdot X}. \quad (3)$$

The wavefunction (3) is labelled by a set of five numerical constants, namely the values of the CDJ matrix $\Psi_{ae} = \lambda_{ae} = \text{const. } \forall a, e$. Equation (3) is a semiclassical wavefunction peaked at $\lambda_{ae} = (\hbar G\nu)^{-1}\bar{X}^{ae}$ for each X^{ae} , which due to the SQC is also a quantum wavefunction characterizing the spacetime. Note due to the Gaussian fall off behavior, that spacetimes corresponding to values of λ_{ae} further from the peak are more suppressed.²

Another result of [5] is that the states (3) have been argued to resolve the problem of time. The conventional Schrödinger representation evolves the state $|\psi\rangle$ in time via the prescription

$$|\psi(T)\rangle = e^{iHT}|\psi_0\rangle. \quad (4)$$

In this representation the evolving state $|\psi\rangle$ is projected onto a complete set of basis states $|X\rangle$ via the prescription

$$|\psi(T)\rangle = \prod_{a,e} \int_{\Gamma} \delta X^{ae} |X\rangle \langle X|\psi(T)\rangle, \quad (5)$$

from which one can read off the wavefunction

$$\psi[X(T)] = \langle X|\psi(T)\rangle. \quad (6)$$

However, (6) when applied to quantum gravity leads to the problem of time since the state (4) cannot evolve on account of the vanishing Hamiltonian $H = 0$.

Our proposed resolution is to rather use a kind of Heisenberg representation, whereby the time evolution is directly encoded in the dynamical variables $X^{ae} = X^{ae}(T)$.³ The state $|\Psi\rangle$ then is an abstract entity independent of any notion of time until projected onto a complete set of basis

²These include pathological spacetimes and spacetimes containing singularities.

³While the Hamiltonian vanishes on account of GR being a totally constrained system, the dynamical variables do exhibit a nontrivial time evolution via the Heisenberg equations of motion $\hat{X}(T) = e^{(i/\hbar)\hat{H}T} \hat{X}_0 e^{-(i/\hbar)\hat{H}T}$. The Hamiltonian generates gauge transformations of the variables, however our interpretation is that the Hamiltonian constraint should be seen in a different light to the kinematic constraints.

states. Exploiting this observation, one can evolve the projection operator to the desired time via

$$I = e^{(i/\hbar)\hat{H}T} I e^{-(i/\hbar)\hat{H}T} = \prod_{a,e} \int_{\Gamma} \delta X^{ae} |X(T)\rangle \langle X(T)| \quad (7)$$

An arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$ can now be projected to an given time T using (7), which allows one to read off the resulting wavefunction

$$\psi[X] = \psi[X(T)] = \langle X(T) | \Psi \rangle. \quad (8)$$

The result is that the left hand side of (8) now inherits a well-defined time evolution from the variables X , thought of as clocks. Therefore the states constructed are intimately intertwined in the classical evolution of this description of gravity and its quantum dynamics. In other words, the state (8) inherits a semiclassical-quantum correspondence due to the variables' evolving in accordance with the initial value constraints consistently with the equations of motion. Let us now examine the equations of motion in some greater detail, starting with vacuum general relativity in anisotropic minisuperspace.

3 Setting the stage with nondegenerate vacuum general relativity ($X = \det A \neq 0$)

The starting action for general relativity in the Chang–Soo variables (Ψ_{ae}, X^{ae}) in anisotropic minisuperspace with Lorentzian signature is given by [5]

$$I_{Soo} = \int_0^T dt \left(-\frac{i}{G} \Psi_{ae} \dot{X}^{ae} + (\det A) \left[-iN \sqrt{\det \Psi} (\Lambda + \text{tr} \Psi^{-1}) + (N^i A_i^d - \theta^d) f_{dbf} \Psi_{bf} \right] \right), \quad (9)$$

where Ψ_{ae} is the CDJ matrix and X^{ae} are the Chang–Soo potentials. The Ashtekar variables [8],[9] can be recovered from (9) via the substitution $\tilde{\sigma}_a^i = \Psi_{ae} B_e^i$, conventionally known as the CDJ Ansatz. The auxilliary variables N , N^i and θ^d take on the same meaning as in the Ashtekar variables as the lapse, shift vector and $SU(2)_-$ rotation angle, respectively.

The Hamilton's equations of motion for the Chang–Soo potentials derived from (9) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}^{ae} &= \frac{\delta \mathbf{H}}{\delta \Psi_{ae}} = i \left[\frac{1}{2} (\Psi^{-1})^{ae} H[N] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - N(\det A) \sqrt{\det \Psi} (\Psi^{-1} \Psi^{-1})^{ae} \right] + (\det A) (N^i A_i^d - \theta^d) f_{dae}; \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and for the CDJ matrix by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Psi}_{ae} &= -\frac{\delta \mathbf{H}}{\delta X^{ae}} = - \left[i \delta_{ae} (\det A)^{-1} H[N] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_{ae} (N^i A_i^d - \theta^d) f_{dbf} \Psi_{bf} + N^i A_i^e \delta_{ad} f_{dbf} \Psi_{bf} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Since the Cauchy development of GR should be consistent with the initial value constraints, then the constraints can be applied wherever they appear in the equations of motion. For the case of nondegenerate Ashtekar curvature, namely $\det B = (\det A)^2 \neq 0^4$ the only constraint contained in (10) is the Hamiltonian constraint $H \sim 0$. On the other hand, (11) contains all of the constraints, which can be seen as follows.

The first term on the right hand side of (11) contains the Hamiltonian constraint since $X \neq 0$, where $X = \text{tr} X^{ae} = \text{tr} B_e^i A_i^a$. The first term on the second line contains a combined kinematic constraint (namely the diffeomorphism and left handed $SU(2)_-$ gauge constraints, since a factor of $1 = X^{-1} X = (\det A)^{-1} (\det A)$ can be inserted to extract these constraints). This leaves the third term on the second line, which may not be as obvious. Using the identity $\delta_{ad} = (A^{-1})_a^j A_j^d$, we can write this term in the form

$$\begin{aligned} N^i A_i^e \delta_{ad} f_{dbf} \Psi_{bf} &= (N^i A_i^e (A^{-1})_a^j) (\det A)^{-1} (\det A) A_j^d f_{dbf} \Psi_{bf} \\ &= \frac{1}{X} (N^i A_i^e (A^{-1})_a^j) H_j \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which contains the diffeomorphism constraint H_j since $(A^{-1})_a^j$ exists. Therefore the equation of motion for the CDJ matrix Ψ_{ae} is a linear combination of constraints and vanishes independently of the gauge choice.⁵ Application of the constraints yields for the CDJ matrix that

$$\dot{\Psi}_{ae} = 0 \rightarrow \Psi_{ae}(T) = \lambda_{(ae)} = \text{const.} \quad \forall a, e, \quad (13)$$

⁴We have used the identity $B_a^i = (\det A) (A^{-1})_a^i$, as well as $X = \text{tr} X^{ae} = \det A$, for anisotropic minisuperspace.

⁵Any gauge fixing must be applied after, and not before, applying the constraints. For example, from the Ψ_{ae} equation of motion, applying the diffeomorphism constraint $\epsilon_{dae} \Psi_{ae} \sim 0$ yields that the CDJ matrix $\Psi_{ae} = \Psi_{(ae)}$ must be symmetric. Hence this gauge-independent information would have been lost had a gauge been prematurely fixed.

which is independent of the kinematic gauge choice since $X \neq 0$. However, for (10), only the Hamiltonian constraint can be used.

To obtain some physical insight into the dynamics, let us choose the gauge $\theta^a = N^i = 0$, leaving the lapse N unspecified. In this gauge, the equations of motion reduce to

$$\dot{X}^{ae} = -iN(\det A)\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae}; \quad \dot{\Psi}_{ae} = 0, \quad (14)$$

where we have defined an internal $SU(2)_- \otimes SU(2)_-$ metric $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae}$ is given by⁶

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae} = \sqrt{\det \Psi}(\Psi^{-1}\Psi^{-1})^{ae}. \quad (15)$$

Equations (14) and (15) resemble the equations of motion for a free particle in classical mechanics, travelling ostensibly through a nine dimensional configuration space. However, the space is actually five dimensional on account of the constraints.

Taking the trace of (14) and dividing through by $X = \text{tr} X^{ae} = \det A$ since $X \neq 0$ due to nondegeneracy, we obtain⁷

$$\frac{\dot{X}}{X} = \frac{d \ln X}{dt} = -i\boldsymbol{\eta}N \quad (16)$$

where we have defined $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae})$. Equation (16) directly integrates to

$$X(T) \equiv X(T; \lambda) = X_0 e^{-i\boldsymbol{\eta}NT}. \quad (17)$$

Note the mass dimension $[\boldsymbol{\eta}] = 1$ which cancels the negative mass dimension of time $[t] = -1$ so that the argument of the exponential is dimensionless. Substituting (17) back into (14) we can now integrate to find each of the Chang–Soo variables X^{ae} . Hence we obtain⁸

$$X^{ae}(T; \lambda) = X_0^{ae} - iN\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae} \int_0^T X(t)dt = X_0^{ae} - iN\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae} X_0 \int_0^T dt e^{-i\boldsymbol{\eta}Nt}. \quad (18)$$

The general solution for the nondegenerate case is given by

⁶This should not be confused with the Minkowski metric η^{ij} for flat spacetime. The context should be unambiguous from our notational use in [5] of $SU(2)_-$ from the beginning of the Latin alphabet as opposed to spatial indices from the middle of the alphabet.

⁷Note that X is actually the Chern–Simons functional for minisuperspace, identified in [10] as the candidate for a time variable in quantum cosmology.

⁸The notation $X(T; \lambda)$ signifies that $X = \det A$ acquires the label of the five numerical constants determined by $\lambda_{ae} \in GL(5, C)$.

$$X^{ae}(T; \lambda) = \left[X_0^{ae} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae}(X_0/\boldsymbol{\eta}) \right] + \boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae}(X_0/\boldsymbol{\eta}) e^{-iN\boldsymbol{\eta}T}. \quad (19)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \boldsymbol{\eta}(\lambda) = \sqrt{\det \lambda} \text{tr}(\lambda \lambda)^{-1}$ depends on the invariants of the matrix λ_{ae} labelling the momenta. Hence, the Chang–Soo variables have inherited the label of the constant λ_{ae} , which is consistent with the equations of motion. The choice $\lambda_{ae} = -\frac{6}{\Lambda} \delta_{ae}$, for Lorentzian signature yields $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \pm \frac{i}{2} \sqrt{6\Lambda}$, which contains inflationary solutions. For Euclidean signature the solutions would be oscillatory with period $(2\pi/3)\sqrt{6/\Lambda}$. A physical temperature has been ascribed to such states in [10].

4 Dynamics of the spacetime metric

We now examine the relation of the new Chang–Soo/CDJ dynamics to the dynamics of the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, still under the condition of nondegeneracy for the Chang–Soo variables. The time time component of the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is still fixed by $g_{00} = N^2$, but the spatial components h_{ij} have been stripped of their status as fundamental variables.

The spatial three metric three metric h_{ij} , in Chang–Soo/CDJ variables converted from the Ashtekar variables is given by

$$h^{ij} = \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_a^i \tilde{\sigma}_a^j}{\det \tilde{\sigma}} = \frac{\Psi_{ae} \Psi_{af}}{\det \Psi} \left(\frac{B_e^i B_f^j}{\det B} \right). \quad (20)$$

The relation to the internal $SU(2)_- \otimes SU(2)_-$ metric $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{ae}$ in (15) stems more directly from the covariant form

$$h_{ij} = (\det \Psi) (\Psi^{-1} \Psi^{-1})^{ef} (B^{-1})_i^e (B^{-1})_j^f (\det B). \quad (21)$$

whereupon the following relation can be written

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}^{ae} = \sqrt{\det \Psi} (\Psi^{-1} \Psi^{-1})^{ae} \equiv (\det \Psi)^{-1/2} h_{ij} \left(\frac{B_a^i B_e^j}{\det B} \right). \quad (22)$$

Making use of the relation $B_a^i = (\det A)(A^{-1})_a^i$ in anisotropic minisuperspace along with the relation $\det B = (\det A)^2 = X^2$, (21) reduces under the solution $\Psi_{ae} = \lambda_{ae}$ to

$$h_{ij} \sim h_{ij}(T; \lambda) = (\det \lambda) (\lambda \lambda)_{ae}^{-1} A_i^a(T) A_j^e(T). \quad (23)$$

Observe that the spatial three metric has acquired the label of $\lambda_{ae} \in GL(5, C)$. Since in the Chang–Soo variables the metric is now a derived quantity, then its components cannot all be determined until eight components of the Ashtekar connection A_i^a have been specified.⁹ The part of the three metric h_{ij} which can be specified is $h = \det(h_{ij}) = (\det\lambda)X^2$, whose time evolution is given by

$$h(T) \equiv h(T; \lambda) = (\det\lambda)X_0^2 \exp[2\sqrt{\det\lambda} \text{tr}(\lambda\lambda)^{-1}T]. \quad (24)$$

Hence in the general solution for the nondegenerate case even h , acquires a the label of the $\lambda_{ae} \in GL(5, C)$. One can then absorb the Ashtekar potential into the definition of left-invariant one forms of an isometry group when one wants to extract a spacetime metric as in

$$ds^2 = -N^2 dt^2 + \sqrt{\det\lambda} \eta_{ae}^{-1} \omega^a \otimes \omega^e \quad (25)$$

where we have defined $\omega^a = A_i^a dx^i$.¹⁰ Let us now specialize to the isotropic sector of the Chang–Soo variables.

4.1 The isotropic sector

In the isotropic sector of Chang–Soo variables, all components of the Ashtekar connection A_i^a are directly related to $X = \det A$, which is in turn fixed by (17). Plugging in the Ansatz $A_i^a = \delta_i^a (\det A)^{1/3} = \delta_i^a X^{1/3}$ into (23),

$$h_{ij}(T; \lambda) = (\det\lambda)(\lambda\lambda)_{ij}^{-1} X_0^{2/3} e^{-i\boldsymbol{\eta}NT} \quad (26)$$

Two questions regarding (26) naturally arise: (i) Reality conditions upon h_{ij} , as with (23), since one would expect the spatial three metric to be real in the classical theory. A necessary condition is for the argument of the exponential in (26) to be real, which would imply that $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ must be imaginary. From the definition (15), this can occur only if $\det\lambda < 0$. Making the replacement $\lambda \rightarrow -\lambda$, we have $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rightarrow i\boldsymbol{\eta}$ which reduces (26) to

$$h_{ij}(T) = -(\det\lambda)(\lambda\lambda)_{ij}^{-1} X_0^{2/3} e^{2\boldsymbol{\eta}NT} \quad (27)$$

⁹According to our interpretation of the Chang–Soo/CDJ variables, all components of A_i^a , and the resulting Ashtekar curvature B_a^i are then freely specifiable except for one, for which $\det A = X$ is fixed by the dynamics of the Chang–Soo variables in anisotropic minisuperspace. This is also evident from the relation $B_a^i = (\det A)(A^{-1})_a^i$.

¹⁰Though, one is not restricted to this type of spacetime, all reference to the Ashtekar variables has still been eliminated, and one is now restricted to nondegenerate λ_{ae} .

where we have taken the positive square root. This in turn implies that $Im[(\det\lambda)(\lambda\lambda)_{ij}^{-1}X_0^{2/3}] = 0$ for all i, j . (ii) Even for an isotropic connection A_i^a the spatial three metric (27) is still not isotropic due to the label λ_{ij} .¹¹ One has the freedom to rotate into a frame in which the metric is diagonal by appropriately choosing a set of invariant one form in analogy to

Let us now examine the state corresponding to an isotropic CDJ matrix λ_{ae} by choosing $\lambda_{ae} = \delta_{ae}\varphi$. Then have $\eta = 3/\sqrt{\varphi}$ and (27) further reduces to

$$h_{ij}(T) = h_{ij}(T; \varphi) = -\delta_{ij} \left(\frac{X_0^{2/3}}{\varphi} \right) e^{\frac{6}{\sqrt{\varphi}} NT} \quad (28)$$

Comparison with the dark energy sector of the FRW model fixes the trace of the CDJ matrix to be $\varphi = \frac{6}{\Lambda}$, where Λ is the cosmological constant. This further reduces (28) to

$$h_{ij}(T; \Lambda) = -\delta_{ij} \left(\frac{\Lambda X_0^{2/3}}{6} \right) e^{\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda}{3}} NT} \quad (29)$$

where we have readjusted the scale factor N by a real numerical constant, still remaining under Lorentzian signature. There are a few implications from the result (29): (i) Starting from the nondegenerate sector of the Chang–Soo variables without any pre-defined metric, a metric has arisen which reduces to a known solution to the FRW equations. (ii) While the FRW model allows for singular metrics at $t = 0$, hence the big bang singularity, this is precluded in the Chang–Soo variables due to (23), which includes the condition of a nondegenerate Ashtekar curvature. (iii) The preclusion of singular metrics can also be interpreted from (29) as the requirement that $\Lambda \neq 0$, since $X_0 \neq 0$ owing to the assumption $X = \det A \neq 0$. This fixes the initial metric at the beginning of the universe ($T = 0$) to be¹²

$$h_{ij}(0; \Lambda) = -\delta_{ij} \left(\frac{\Lambda X_0^{2/3}}{6} \right). \quad (30)$$

A necessary condition for the avoidance of the big bang singularity at $t = 0$ is then that $\Lambda \neq 0$. Since the universe is inflating according to (29) for $N > 0$, then this condition is automatically met. Hence we have shown, as a result

¹¹This can be interpreted as a more general description than the inflatory FRW model which includes anisotropy.

¹²Note that the expression is dimensionless, as it should be for a metric. Since Λ is small, then the initial size of the universe is then directly determined by the initial value of the Ashtekar curvature through X , which can be regarded as one of the physical parameters of the model.

of the classical dynamics of the Chang–Soo variables, that the presence of inflation implies an avoidance of the big bang singularity.¹³ If a quantum theory of gravity is indeed ultimately necessary for such a resolution, as is commonly agreed in the existing literature on the subject, then it would imply a semiclassical-quantum correspondence for the Chang–Soo dynamics of gravity.

5 The degenerate sector ($\det A=0$)

Although we have excluded the regime of degeneracy ($\det A = 0$) from the domain of applicability of our Hilbert space in [5], it is nevertheless of interest to examine some of the corresponding solutions for physical interpretation and for completeness. One consequence of the degeneracy condition is that the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ must be degenerate. This can be seen from the definition of the metric as a composite variable in the Chang–Soo variables, taking the determinant of $h h^{ij} = \tilde{\sigma}_a^i \tilde{\sigma}_a^j$

$$h = \det(h_{ij}) = \det \tilde{\sigma} = (\det \Psi)(\det B) = X^2 \det \Psi = 0 \quad (31)$$

However, as we will show, it is still possible to obtain well-defined time evolution for the CDJ variables in this case as implied by (31).

Recall the expression for the Hamiltonian constraint in the Chang–Soo variables

$$H = (\det A) \sqrt{\det \Psi} \left(\Lambda + \text{tr} \Psi^{-1} \right). \quad (32)$$

The quantity $\det A$ is part of the definition of the constraint, therefore when $\det A = 0$ the constraint is automatically satisfied. Let us now revisit the equations of motion (10) and (11) under the condition of degeneracy. Starting with the equation for X^{ae}

$$\dot{X}^{ae} = (\det A) \left[N \left(\frac{i}{2} \sqrt{\det \Psi} \left(\Lambda + \text{tr} \Psi^{-1} \right) + (N^i A_i^d - \theta^d) f_{dae} \right) \right]. \quad (33)$$

Since $\det A = 0$, then $\dot{X}^{ae} = 0$ satisfies the equation of motion independently of the gauge. Hence we have

$$\dot{X}^{ae} = 0; \quad X^{ae}(t) = \text{const.} \quad \forall a, e. \quad (34)$$

¹³This result is consistent with an increasing amount of observational evidence pointing to a small but positive Λ [11], [12],[13].

From (34), the Chang–Soo variables form a degenerate matrix of numerical constants $X^{ae} = X_0^{ae}$. Since $X = \det A = 0 = X_0$, the matrix remains degenerate for all times. Therefore, the degenerate case remains a distinct sector of vacuum GR which cannot be bridged.¹⁴

One ramification is that the states $\Psi_\lambda[X] = e^{\lambda \cdot X}$ as currently defined in [5] cease to describe the physics, since the quantum state arose from the canonical structure $\Psi_{ae} \dot{X}^{ae}$ of the theory. Additionally, the problem of time would exist for these states with respect to the variable X^{ae} because it cannot evolve the state to a new time.¹⁵

Moving on to the equation of motion for the CDJ matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Psi}_{ae} = & i\delta_{ae}N\sqrt{\det\Psi}\left(\Lambda + \text{tr}\Psi^{-1}\right) \\ & + \left[\delta_{ae}(N^i A_i^d - \theta^d) + N^i A_i^e \delta_{ad}\right] f_{dbf} \Psi_{bf}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Recall the expressions for the kinematic constraints

$$G_a = -(\det A) f_{ace} \Psi_{ce}; \quad H_i = (\det A) N^i A_i^d \epsilon_{dae} \Psi_{ae}. \quad (36)$$

Since (36) is to $\det A$, the kinematic constraints are automatically satisfied for $X = \det A = 0$. However, (36) is insufficient to make the antisymmetric part of the CDJ matrix $\Psi_{[ae]}$ vanish, as they did for the nondegenerate case. Additionally, there is no Hamiltonian constraint in (35), which removes the previous restrictions on time evolution of the CDJ matrix. Again, in contrast to the nondegenerate case in which it was X^{ae} which contained the nontrivial evolution with $\Psi_{ae} = \lambda_{ae}$ being constants. In a certain sense, as a result of degeneracy the ‘coordinate’ and ‘momentum’ variables have essentially ‘exchanged’ roles due to the degeneracy.

To obtain some physical insight into the dynamics we will need to choose the $N^i = \theta^d = 0$ gauge.¹⁶ The equation of motion for Ψ_{ae} in this gauge reads

$$\dot{\Psi}_{ae} = -i\delta_{ae}N\sqrt{\det\Psi}\left(\Lambda + \text{tr}\Psi^{-1}\right) \quad (37)$$

Let us now solve (37) to obtain the time evolution of the CDJ matrix under the condition of degeneracy.

¹⁴As a result of the SQC, the variable cannot evolve in time from the $X = 0$ sector into the $X \neq 0$ sector, since the equations of motion are assumed to hold for all time. Due to the semiclassical-quantum correspondence, the classical and the quantum evolution of the state are equivalent. Consequently, the dynamics of gravity in the Chang–Soo variables would preclude topology change. This is unlike in [14] and works by other authors on quantum gravity.

¹⁵We will show in a later section how to incorporate the degenerate regime into the Chang–Soo/CDJ quantum dynamics.

¹⁶This time, simplifying the analysis of Ψ_{ae} . Note, it is precisely this gauge which was needed for the $X \neq 0$ case for the conjugate variable X^{ae} .

6 Time evolution of the CDJ matrix in the degenerate case

Let us recount the equations of motion for completeness

$$\dot{\Psi}_{ae} = -i\delta_{ae}N\sqrt{\det\Psi}\left(\Lambda + \text{tr}\Psi^{-1}\right); \quad \dot{X}^{ae} = 0. \quad (38)$$

Equation (38) states that the time derivative of the CDJ matrix is an isotropic matrix, due to the δ_{ae} , which means that the off-diagonal parts are numerical constants. Let consider first the case of symmetric CDJ matrices for simplicity.¹⁷ Then the CDJ matrix could be written in the form

$$\Psi_{ae} = \begin{pmatrix} a & W & V \\ W & b & U \\ V & U & c \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence for a symmetric CDJ matrix we have that $\dot{U} = \dot{V} = \dot{W} = 0$, which would mean that the shear components U , V and W are numerical constants. To fix these constants let us perform a complex orthogonal transformation of (53) to diagonalize $\dot{\Psi}_{ae}$. Using a $SO(3, C)$ matrix O_{ab} we have for the left hand side that

$$O_{ab}\dot{\Psi}_{bc}O_{ce}^T = \frac{d}{dt}(O_{ab}\Psi_{bc}O_{ce}^T = \frac{d}{dt}\text{Diag}(a, b, c). \quad (39)$$

Since the right hand side of (53) is isotropic owing to the isotropic matrix δ_{ae} , then it is invariant under the $SO(3, C)$ transformation. This implies that the matrix Ψ_{ae} is already in diagonal form, hence that $U = V = W = 0$. Therefore the most general form of $\dot{\Psi}_{ae}$ is really given by

$$\dot{\Psi}_{ae} = \delta_{ae}m + \epsilon_{aed}n^d \quad (40)$$

for some m and n^d .

We will first consider the class of solutions for which $n^d = 0$. The equations of motion read, given that X^{ae} are constants,

$$\dot{a} = \dot{b} = \dot{c} = iN\sqrt{abc}\left(\Lambda + \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c}\right) \quad (41)$$

The time derivatives of the diagonal elements are equal, which implies that these elements must be equal, within numerical constants, to each other.

¹⁷This is a simplifying assumption, and not a consequence of the constraints or the dynamics. We will consider the more general case in the next section.

$$b(t) = a(t) + k_1; \quad c(t) = a(t) + k_2 \quad (42)$$

for arbitrary constants k_1 and k_2 . These constants can be used to label the resulting state, though it is not described by [5].¹⁸ In the general case the equation of motion can be integrated

$$\int_{a_0}^{a(T)} (a(a + k_1)(a + k_2))^{-1/2} \left(\Lambda + \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{a + k_1} + \frac{1}{a + k_2} \right)^{-1} da = iNT. \quad (43)$$

The left hand side of (43) can be written in closed form in terms of known functions, but we do not display the result it here. Let us rather use a compact notation to describe the integral.

$$I_\Lambda(a; k_1, k_2) = iNt \quad (44)$$

denotes the most general case for vanishing off-diagonal components, with nonzero cosmological constant.

6.1 A few simple cases within the diagonal sector

Let us now illustrate a few simple examples for the degenerate case for which short expressions can be written.

(i) Isotropic case with nonzero Λ . In this case we have $k_1 = k_2 = 0$. The equation of motion reduces to

$$\dot{a} = iNa^{3/2} \left(\Lambda + \frac{3}{a} \right) \quad (45)$$

Equation (45) directly integrates to

$$I_\Lambda(a; 0, 0) = iNT; \quad a(T) = \frac{3}{\Lambda} \tan \left[\tan^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda a_0}{3}} + \frac{\sqrt{3\Lambda}}{2} iNT \right) \right] \quad (46)$$

For $\Lambda = 0$ we have

$$a(T) = \left(\sqrt{a_0} + \frac{3}{2} iNT \right)^2 \quad (47)$$

¹⁸One could however carry out a similar canonical analysis in which the ‘coordinate’ and ‘momentum’ variables have exchanged roles and then construct the analogous Hilbert space of states as functionals of Ψ_{ae} in lieu of X^{ae} , which we will briefly illustrate in the last section.

(ii) One diagonal degree of freedom. In this case $k_2 = 0$, $k_1 = k$ where k is an arbitrary numerical constant. Then we have

$$\dot{a} = iNa\sqrt{a+k}\left(\Lambda + \frac{2}{a} + \frac{1}{a+k}\right) \quad (48)$$

Equation (48) integrates to

$$I_\Lambda(a; k, 0) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\Lambda}} \left[\frac{r_- \tanh^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\Lambda(a+k)}}{r_-}\right) - r_+ \tanh^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\Lambda(a+k)}}{r_+}\right)}{k\Lambda - 3 - r_-^2} \right] = iNT \quad (49)$$

where we have defined the dimensionless constants

$$r_- = \sqrt{k\Lambda - 3 - \sqrt{k^2\Lambda^2 - 2k\Lambda + 9}}; \quad r_+ = \sqrt{k\Lambda - 3 + \sqrt{k^2\Lambda^2 - 2k\Lambda + 9}}. \quad (50)$$

While solved in closed form, the relation (40) is nontrivial to invert for $a = a(t)$, but nevertheless the solution is implicit. The $\Lambda = 0$ case leads to the relation

$$I_0(a; k, 0) = \frac{2}{3} \left[\sqrt{a+k} - \sqrt{\frac{k}{3}} \tanh^{-1}\left(\sqrt{3\left(1 + \frac{a}{k}\right)}\right) \right] = iNT. \quad (51)$$

Likewise, the relation (51) is implicit but still nevertheless illustrates the integrability of the system.

(iii) General diagonal case for $\Lambda = 0$. This is given by

$$I_0(a; k_1, k_2) = \int_{a_0}^{a(T)} \frac{\sqrt{a(a+k_1)(a+k_2)}}{3a^2 + 2a(k_1+k_2) + k_1k_2} da = iNT \quad (52)$$

The relation (52) can as well be integrated in closed form in terms of known functions, though we do not display the final expression here due to its unwieldiness.

7 The degenerate general case

We now treat the general solution degenerate case for vacuum GR in the Chang–Soo/CDJ variables. Returning to the equation of motion,

$$\dot{\Psi}_{ae} = -i\delta_{ae}N\sqrt{\det\Psi}\left(\Lambda + \text{tr}\Psi^{-1}\right); \quad \dot{X}^{ae} = 0, \quad (53)$$

we now solve the equations of motion, allowing for the most general form of the CDJ matrix Ψ_{ae} .¹⁹ This is given by

$$\Psi_{ae} = \begin{pmatrix} a & W - w & V - v \\ W + w & b & U - u \\ V + v & U + u & c \end{pmatrix}.$$

It will be convenient to parametrize the CDJ matrix into its isotropic and its non-isotropic parts, as in

$$\Psi_{ae} = \delta_{ae}\varphi + \epsilon_{ae}. \quad (54)$$

In (54), φ is the isotropic part and ϵ_{ae} is defined as the ‘CDJ deviation matrix’, encodes the deviation of the CDJ matrix from isotropy. Substitution of (54) into (53) yields

$$\dot{\epsilon}_{ae} = 0; \quad \epsilon_{ae} = \text{const.} \quad \forall a, e \quad (55)$$

The deviation matrix ϵ_{ae} is in general an 8 by 8 matrix of arbitrary complex numerical constants.

Let us now re-examine the equation of motion for Ψ_{ae} . This can be written as one equation labelled by the constants $\epsilon_{ae} \in GL(8, C)$.

$$\dot{\varphi} = -iN\sqrt{\det(\delta_{ae}\varphi + \epsilon_{ae})}(\Lambda + \text{tr}(\delta_{ae}\varphi + \epsilon_{ae})^{-1}). \quad (56)$$

To solve the equation of motion (56) we will need the determinant, given by

$$\det\Psi_{ae} = \det(\delta_{ae}\varphi + \epsilon_{ae}) = \varphi^3 + \varphi^2\epsilon + \frac{1}{2}\varphi\text{Var}\epsilon + \det\epsilon \quad (57)$$

where we have defined

$$\epsilon = \delta_{ae}\epsilon_{ae} - \text{tr}(\epsilon_{ae}); \quad \text{Var}\epsilon = (\delta_{bf}\delta_{cg} - \delta_{cf}\delta_{bg})\epsilon_{bf}\epsilon_{cg} = (\text{tr}\epsilon)^2 - \text{tr}\epsilon^2. \quad (58)$$

We will also need the inverse of (54). Let us assume for simplicity that the isotropic part φ is the largest component.²⁰ Hence, $\varphi > \epsilon_{ae} \quad \forall a, e$, with $\varphi \neq 0$. Then we have

¹⁹Recall that we have shown for the degenerate case that the kinematic constraints are insufficient to eliminate the antisymmetric (rotation) elements of Ψ_{ae} .

²⁰The trace is the dynamical component and will vary in time. Therefore, the expansion is good only for $t = \tau$ such that $\varphi(\tau) > \max\{\epsilon_{ae}\}$. Since the non-isotropic components are numerical constants, then $\forall t$ such that $\varphi(t) > \epsilon_{ae} \quad \forall a, e$ do not hold, then a singularity exists and one can must attempt to find the solution for different ϵ_{ae} . Hence we have shown that singularities can develop only when considering degenerate configurations.

$$\Psi_{ae}^{-1} = (\delta_{ae}\varphi + \epsilon_{ae})^{-1} = \varphi^{-1} \delta_{aa_0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \varphi^{-n} \epsilon_{a_0 a_1} \epsilon_{a_1 a_2} \dots \epsilon_{a_{n-1} a_n} \delta_{a_n e} \quad (59)$$

The trace of (59) is given by

$$\text{tr} \Psi^{-1} = \varphi^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \varphi^{-n} \epsilon_{aa_1} \epsilon_{a_1 a_2} \dots \epsilon_{a_{n-1} a} \quad (60)$$

Likewise, the square root of the determinant can be expanded as in

$$\sqrt{\det \Psi} = \varphi^{3/2} \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\varphi} + \frac{\text{Var} \epsilon}{2\varphi^2} + \frac{\det \epsilon}{\varphi^3} \right)^{1/2} \quad (61)$$

Then one can use the infinite binomial series expansion

$$\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\varphi} + \frac{\text{Var} \epsilon}{2\varphi^2} + \frac{\det \epsilon}{\varphi^3} \right)^{1/2} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n (2n)!}{(1-2n)n! 2^{2n}} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\varphi} + \frac{\text{Var} \epsilon}{2\varphi^2} + \frac{\det \epsilon}{\varphi^3} \right)^n. \quad (62)$$

We must now put (60) and (62) back into (56).

7.1 Asymptotic expansion about the isotropic sector

We are now ready to write down the general solution for the degenerate case to all orders. The equation of motion for φ can be written as

$$\left(\Lambda + \frac{3}{\varphi} \right) \varphi^{-3/2} \dot{\varphi} = -iNE(\varphi, \epsilon) \quad (63)$$

where we have defined a ‘correction’ factor for non-isotropy E

$$E(\varphi, \epsilon) = \left[1 - \varphi^{-2} \left(\Lambda + \frac{3}{\varphi} \right)^{-1} I_1(\varphi, \epsilon_{ae}) \right] I_3(\varphi, \epsilon_{ae}), \quad (64)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(\varphi, \epsilon_{ae}) &= \delta_{a_0} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n \varphi^{-n} \epsilon_{aa_1} \epsilon_{a_1 a_2} \dots \epsilon_{a_{n-1} a_n} \delta_{a_n, e}; \\ I_3(\varphi, \epsilon_{ae}) &= \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\varphi} + \frac{\text{Var} \epsilon}{2\varphi^2} + \frac{\det \epsilon}{\varphi^3} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

The left hand side of (63) is reduces to the isotropic case considered in (45). Upon integration, we have

$$\int_0^T \left(\Lambda + \frac{3}{\varphi} \right) \varphi^{-3/2} d\varphi = -iN \int_0^T E(\varphi(t), \epsilon) dt \quad (66)$$

which can be written in the form

$$\tan^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda \varphi(T)}{3}} \right) = \tan^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda \varphi_0}{3}} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{3\Lambda}}{2} \int_0^T E(\varphi(t), \epsilon) dt. \quad (67)$$

Equation (67) further simplifies to

$$\sqrt{\varphi(T; \epsilon)} = \left(\sqrt{\varphi_0} + \frac{3}{\Lambda \sqrt{\varphi_0}} \right) \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda \varphi_0}{3}} \tan \frac{\sqrt{3\Lambda}}{2} \int_0^T E(\varphi; \epsilon) dt \right]^{-1} - \frac{3}{\Lambda \sqrt{\varphi_0}}. \quad (68)$$

We can now generate an asymptotic expansion about the exact isotropic solution by fixed point iteration procedure, since the right hand side of (66) is small. First, choose a particular state ϵ_{ae} , thought of as a constant vector in an eight complex dimensional space. Next, define a sequence of functions of time $\varphi_n(t)$, such that $\varphi = \varphi_0$, which is the initial value of the isotropic part of the CDJ matrix at time $t = 0$.²¹ Define sequence φ_n , such that

$$\varphi_{n+1}(T) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{\Lambda}} \tan \left[\tan^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Lambda \varphi_0}{3}} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{3\Lambda}}{2} \int_0^T E(\varphi_n(t), \epsilon) dt \right]. \quad (69)$$

The full-blown solution, assuming convergence of the sequence (69), is given by $\varphi(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(t)$. Hence, if it is indeed the case that there was a phase of the universe in which degenerate metrics exist, (i) The universe cannot transition into a nondegenerate state if the SQC holds. (ii) The existence of such a configuration is labelled by eight arbitrary complex constants for the ϵ_{ae} , each of which defines a state of the universe. (iii) The convergence of the sequence (69) is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for the well-definedness of this configuration.²² This in turn depends upon the initial value of φ_0 in relation to the constants ϵ_{ae} .²³

²¹This time labels the beginning of the universe, and φ_0 is an essential parameter of the theory.

²²There is clearly a large category of cosmological evidence that dictates that the space-time metric today is nondegenerate.

²³The theorist has the free choice of the ϵ_{ae} . However, φ_0 is determined by the initial conditions of the universe, which can only be extrapolated from the cosmological data in existence today. Since according to conventional classical GR and Hawking–Ellis theorems, the Einstein’s equations break down in this regime, then the conclusion is that the Chang–Soo/CDJ description must exclude these degenerate configurations on experimental grounds, based upon [5].

8 Discussion: Hilbert space structure for the degenerate case

We have shown that the states $\Psi_\lambda[X] = e^{\lambda \cdot X}$ which were derived in [5] are based upon a nondegenerate configuration of the Chang–Soo variables. For these states the Chang–Soo variables X^{ae} are the dynamical variables and the CDJ matrix $\Psi_{ae} = \lambda_{ae}$ are numerical constants which play the role of labels. Hence the state satisfies the SQC in corresponding to the time evolution of the variables $X^{ae} = X^{ae}(T)$ in accordance with the equations of motion and the quantum constraints. However, as we have seen in the degenerate case it the variables X^{ae} which are numerical constants, with Ψ_{ae} undergoing a nontrivial time evolution. This suggests that in the degenerate case $X = 0$, the variables X^{ae} could serve as labels with the variables Ψ_{ae} being fully dynamical. So the question arises as to what states describe the degenerate case, given that the states in [5] do not.

We have implied that the roles of the Chang–Soo/CDJ variables become reversed in going from the nondegenerate into the degenerate case. Given that the quantum wavefunction for the Chang–Soo variables are given by

$$\psi_\lambda[X] = e^{-\frac{\nu}{2}\lambda^* \cdot \lambda} e^{(\hbar G)^{-1} \lambda \cdot X}. \quad (70)$$

which are Gaussians in λ_{ae} peaked on configurations for which $X = \nu\lambda$, then this implies that one could make the switch $\lambda \leftrightarrow X$ to obtain in the nondegenerate case²⁴

$$\phi_Y[\Psi] = e^{-\frac{\nu}{2}Y^* \cdot Y} e^{(\hbar G)^{-1} Y \cdot \Psi}. \quad (71)$$

Within the schema of [5], the nondegenerate states arose via the canonical structure $\Psi_{ae} \dot{X}^{ae}$ from transformation of the Ashtekar variables. Due to X^{ae} now being constants upon implementation of the constraints, which we assume consistent with the equations of motion, this canonical structure would vanish. The remedy, to handle the degenerate case, is to perform a canonical transformation at the level of the phase space so that X^{ae} play the role of momenta with Ψ_{ae} being the coordinates. This can be done through the manipulations

$$\int_0^T dt \Psi_{ae}(t) \dot{X}^{ae}(t) = (\Psi_{ae}(T) X^{ae}(T) - \Psi_{ae}(0) X^{ae}(0)) - \int_0^T X^{ae} \dot{\Psi}_{ae}. \quad (72)$$

The result is a boundary term that doesn't affect the classical equations of motion, though which becomes important in the quantum theory. One may

²⁴Here we have used the symbol $Y \equiv Y^{ae}$ to denote numerical constant values of the matrix X^{ae} .

then append the constraints (same constraints as in (9)) to the canonical structure (72) in order to obtain a new action of the form

$$I_{Soo} = \int_0^T dt \left(\frac{i}{G} X^{ae} \dot{\Psi}_{ae} + (\det A) \left[-iN\sqrt{\det \Psi} (\Lambda + \text{tr} \Psi^{-1}) + (N^i A_i^d - \theta^d) f_{dae} \Psi_{ae} \right] \right). \quad (73)$$

Note that at this stage all we have performed is a manipulation of the Chang–Soo starting action, hence the degeneracy condition cannot yet be applied. Degeneracy is a special case, as any other configuration, for which physical quantities of interest should be evaluated on the particular configuration after all consistency conditions²⁵ have been satisfied. Therefore the correct procedure is to evaluate the equations of motion on the configuration of a degenerate B_a^i , which is what we have done in the present section.

One could go through the analogous developments as in [5], which we do not do here. But to give a taste of what is involved, one could attempt to redefine the projection operator onto the new states

$$I = \prod_{a,e} \int_{\Gamma} \delta\mu(\Psi) |\Psi(T)\rangle \langle \Psi(T)| = \prod_{a,e} \int_{\Gamma} \delta X^{ae} \Psi_{\zeta}^*(X) \Psi_{\lambda}(X) \quad (74)$$

where $\Psi = \Psi_{ae}$ is the CDJ matrix and $D\mu(\Psi)$ is a measure Gaussian in Ψ_{ae} . However, from the analysis of the previous section, under degeneracy conditions the only dynamical component of the CDJ matrix is given by the isotropic part φ . Putting the representation $\varphi_{ae} = \delta_{ae}\varphi + \epsilon_{ae}$ into (75), where ϵ_{ae} are numerical constants and $\det A = X = 0$, we have

$$I_{Soo} = \frac{i}{G} \int_0^T dt (X^{ae} \dot{\epsilon}_{ae} + X \dot{\varphi}) = \frac{i}{G} \int_0^T dt (X \dot{\varphi}) \quad (75)$$

where we have used $\dot{\epsilon}_{ae} = 0$. Recall that $X = \text{tr} X^{ae}$ is a numerical constant. However, $X = 0$ due to degeneracy and $I_{Soo} = 0$. Therefore, the degenerate wavefunction is a numerical constant labelled by the boundary term arising from the canonical transformation into momentum coordinates $X^{ae} \epsilon_{ae}$. The resulting Hilbert space is not well-defined, since any particular configuration of a continuous infinity of configurations spanning $GL(16, C)$.²⁶

²⁵e.g. itmes such as consrtaints and equations of motion

²⁶There are now 16 complex constants labelling the state. Eight due to ϵ_{ae} , which is independent of the classical evolution of $\varphi = \varphi(t)$, and eight constants for X^{ae} (one of the original nine constants determines the degeneracy condition).

9 Conclusion

We have illustrated some of the dynamics of gravity in terms of the Chang–Soo variables. Although ostensibly a classical treatment, we have incorporated the full quantum dynamics of the model by making use of the initial value constraints in the equations of motion. Starting from the Chang–Soo variables, which are defined independently of the existence of a spacetime metric, we have derived solutions which correspond to a class of inflating spacetimes labelled by the values of the CDJ matrix corresponding to the quantum state. We have also demonstrated that the big bang singularity can be avoided in these new variables independently of any quantum corrections by applying the equations of motion to all times, including the beginning of the universe when quantum effects are presumably dominant. This implies a semiclassical-quantum correspondence for the variables in that the family of states, while semiclassical, are exact quantum states. We have also illustrated the dynamics of the theory in the degenerate sector, displaying an array of new solutions for GR. Another result of the initial value constraints development in these variables is that an initially degenerate solution will remain degenerate for all times, which eliminates topology change due to the SQC.

The present paper has demonstrated the anisotropic minisuperspace sector of the model, which include a generalization of the results of [15] to include more general solutions to the Einstein equations beyond DeSitter spacetime. We have also provided a prescription for obtaining general solutions by asymptotic expansion about an isotropic solution. It is hoped that this algorithm can be of use as well in numerical treatments of general relativity. Futures line of development for the new variables will include a treatment of inflationary cosmology for coupling of the Chang–Soo variables to matter fields, starting next with the inflaton field and moving on to fermions and the standard model fields. We will also demonstrate the analogous developments in the full theory, and complete the quantum description for these new variables in the construction of finite states.

References

- [1] Stephen Hawking and Roger Penrose ‘The Nature of Space and Time’ Princeton University Press, 1996
- [2] Ian D Lawrie ‘A unified Grand Tour of Theoretical Physics’ IOP Publishing Ltd 2002
- [3] Martin Bojowald ‘Quantum gravity and cosmological observations’ arXiv: gr-qc/0701142

- [4] Richard Capovilla, Ted Jacobsen, John Dell ‘General Relativity without the Metric’ *Class. Quant. Grav.* Vol 63, Number 21 (1989) 2325-2328
- [5] Eyo Eyo Ita III ‘Vacuum GR in Chang–Soo variables: Hilbert space structure in anisotropic minisuperspace’ arXiv: gr-qc/0901.3041
- [6] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev.* D23, 347 (1981)
- [7] Chopin Soo and Lay Nam Chang ‘Superspace dynamics and perturbations around ”emptiness”’ *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D3* (1994) 529-544
- [8] Ahbay Ashtekar ‘New Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity’ *Phys. Rev.* D36(1987)1587
- [9] Ahbay Ashtekar ‘New variables for clasical and quantum gravity’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* Volume 57, number 18 (1986)
- [10] Chopin Soo and Lee Smolin ‘The Chern–Simons invariant as the natural time variable for classical and quantum cosmology’ *Nucl. Phys.* B449 (1995) 289-316
- [11] Gersson Goldhaber ‘Evidence for a cosmological constant and for the expansion of the universe’ Berkeley Institute of Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics study’
- [12] ZSolt F. Hetsi and Lajos G Balazs ‘Do Type 1A supernovae prove a positive cosmological constant?’ *PADEU* 15, 159 (2005)
- [13] Idit Zehavi and Avishai Dekel ‘Evidence for a positive cosmological constant from flows of galaxies and distant supernovae’ astro-ph/990422
- [14] Gary T Horowitz ‘Topology change in classical and quantum gravity’, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 8(1991) 587-601
- [15] Eyo Eyo Ita III ‘Finite states in four dimensional quantized gravity’ *Class. Quantum Grav.* 25 (2008) 125002. The isotropic minisuperspace Ashtekar–Klein–Gordon model.’